Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-09)
Approved for use through 07/31/2012. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)
22727/04125

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on July 27, 2009

Signature /milan jovanovic/

Typed or printed name Milan Jovanovic

Application Number	Filed
10/617,078	July 10, 2003

First Named Inventor	
Steven P. Schwendeman	
Art Unit	**Examiner**
1617	Betton, Timothy E.

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).
Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

- ☐ applicant/inventor.
- ☐ assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)
- ☐ attorney or agent of record. Registration number _____.
- ☑ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 60,798

/milan jovanovic/
Signature

Milan Jovanovic
Typed or printed name

614-621-7768
Telephone number

July 27, 2009
Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

☑ *Total of 1 forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING
I hereby certify that this document is being transmitted electronically via the United States Patent and Trademark Office's Electronic Filing Service (EFS-Web) on this 27th day of July, 2009.

/milan jovanovic/
Milan Jovanovic

Customer Number
24024

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	
Schwendeman *et al.*	Group Art Unit: 1617
Application No.: 10/617,078	Confirmation No.: 3384
Filed: July 10, 2003	Examiner: Betton, Timothy E.
For: **ANTIGEN-POLYMER COMPOSITIONS**	Attorney Docket No.: 22727/04125

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

This paper is filed together with a Notice of Appeal and Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review. The review is requested for the reasons stated below.

Claims 1-6 and 27-62 are pending in the instant application and claims 27-29 stand as withdrawn from consideration. The Office rejected claims 1-6 and 30-62.

Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office has rejected claims 1-3, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrianov *et al.* (USPN 5,529,777) in view of Sokoll *et al.* (USPN 6,228,423 B1). The Office has asserted that Andrianov teaches a method of eliciting an immune response as in claim 1 of the instant application, wherein: PLGA is the biodegradable polymer microparticle of claim 1; a peptide, among other disclosed antigens, is the one or more antigens also of claim 1; and, magnesium incorporated with a polyelectrolyte preparation is the encapsulated one or more basic additives also of claim 1. The Office stipulates that Andrianov does not teach the basic additive of magnesium carbonate. However, the Office refers to Sokoll, which it asserts teaches magnesium carbonate as a normally employed excipient for oral formulations. In conclusion, the Office states that:

> "it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Andrianov et al. to accommodate the disclosure of magnesium carbonate in the formulation as in Sokoll et al. Both referenced. [*sic*] patents teach a PLGA directed to delivery of an antigen to a specific region in a mammal. Therefore, it would at once have been obvious to combine both references due to their relative similarity in scope of invention, i.e., delivery of antigen by a polymeric delivery system."

Office Action mailed September 30, 2008, page 6, and Office Action mailed March 26, 2009, page 5.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. There are only 2 references to magnesium in Andrianov, in the first full paragraph of column 7 and the fourth full paragraph of column 11. Both references to magnesium in Andrianov relate to the use of divalent and trivalent metal ions to crosslink the polymers used to make microspheres, i.e., magnesium is used as a crosslinking agent. There is no reference in Andrianov that addition of magnesium in any way influences immune response. In fact, Andrianov discloses that an effect of the crosslinking agents is to regulate the release of antigen from the microspheres. *See* Andrianov, Column 18, first and second full paragraphs. Furthermore, Andrianov discloses various adjuvants for enhanced immunogenicity and does not include magnesium or any other basic additive as an adjuvant. *See* Andrianov, Column 13, first 4 full paragraphs. It is clear that Andrianov contemplates the use of magnesium as a crosslinking agent to control the release of an antigen from a microsphere, NOT as an adjuvant for increasing immunogenicity of the antigen as in the claimed invention.

Furthermore, the reference to Sokoll must be analyzed in its entirety. The reference to magnesium carbonate in Sokoll refers to use of magnesium carbonate as an excipient for oral formulations. Sokoll, Column 11, fourth full paragraph. Sokoll further discloses that protection from an acidic environment is obtained via administration of an acid neutralizing preparation before, concomitant with, or directly after oral administration of the microparticles. Sokoll, Column 11, fifth full paragraph. It is clear that Sokoll does not disclose the use of magnesium carbonate to enhance immunogenicity, but rather as an excipient. *Taber's Cyclopedic Medical Dictionary* defines "excipient" as any substance added to a medicine to permit it to be formed into the proper shape and consistency; the vehicle for the drug. Clearly, Sokoll does not disclose

magnesium carbonate for a method to enhance an immunogenic response as in the claimed invention.

These distinctions are vital to a proper obviousness analysis under *Graham*, as factor 1 is determining the scope and content of the prior art, and factor 2 is ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office has not properly determined the scope and content of Andrianov and Sokoll, nor has the Office properly ascertained the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. Therefore, the Office has not established a prima facie case of obviousness.

Furthermore, Applicant again respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no reason whatsoever to combine the teachings of Andrianov and Sokoll in the absence of the instant claims. Neither Andrianov or Sokoll identify a problem that would cause one of ordinary skill to look to another reference to solve. Also, one of ordinary skill in art would not look to Sokoll's use of magnesium carbonate as an excipient as a replacement for Andrianov's use of magnesium as a crosslinking agent to form a microsphere. The disclosed uses of magnesium in Andrianov and Sokoll are not analogous in any way, nor would they render obvious the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoch, E.P. (Industrial and Engineering Chemistry; Direct Titrometric Methods for Magnesium, Calcium, and Sulfate Ions and Their Application in Water Analysis; 1926, Vol. 19, No. 1, page 112) and CHEMTUTOR, LLC Acids and Bases; The 5% Rule, Copyright 1997, page 17, in view of Lenntech (Magnesium and water, Chemical Properties, Health and Environmental Effects; Copyright 1998, page 1). The Office has asserted that Schoch teaches pH value ranges for magnesium and magnesium ion as encompassed in claim 4 of the instant application, CHEMTUTOR teaches the measurement of pH in medicine, which is disclosed at 37°C, and Lenntech teaches water solubility of magnesium carbonate. In conclusion, the Office states it would have been prima facie obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the art disclosed in Schoch with that of CHEMTUTOR and Lenntech.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. The Office is reminded that a dependent claim necessarily imports all of the limitations of the claim from which it depends. In the instant case, claim 4 depends from claim 2, which depends from claim 30, which depends from claim 1. Therefore, all the limitations of claims 1, 30, and 2 are necessarily present in claim 4 as if fully re-written therein. It is this combination that must be compared to the prior art, exactly as if it were presented as one independent claim. M.P.E.P. § 608.01(n) III, fourth full paragraph. There is nothing in Schoch, CHEMTUTOR, and Lenntech that discloses methods of enhancing an immunogenic response in a mammalian subject, or administering microparticles of a biodegradable polymer, or that the microparticles comprise a biologically effective amount of one or more antigens, or that the microparticles also encapsulate one or more basic additives as disclosed in claim 1, and which are imported into dependent claim 4 along with the limitations of claims 30 and 2. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 4 is not prima facie obvious in light of the teachings of Schoch, CHEMTUTOR, and Lenntech, as the Office has not shown that the cited references teach each and every element and limitation of claim 4, and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office has rejected claims 30-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elahi *et al.* (USPN 4,280,816), Wright *et al.* (USPN 6,379,704 B2), and Thanavala *et al.* (Affinity, Cross-Reactivity, and Biological Effectiveness of Rabbit Monoclonal Antibodies Against a Synthetic 37 Amino Acid C-Terminal Peptide of Human Chorionic Gonadotropin, Clin. Exp. Immunol. (1980) 39, 112-118), in view of Setterstrom *et al.* (USPN 6,309,669 B1).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. The Office is again reminded that a dependent claim necessarily imports all of the limitations of the claim from which it depends. In the instant case claim 30 depends from claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 30, as well as all claims the depend from claim 30, necessarily import all of the limitations of claim 1. It is this combination that must be compared to the prior art, exactly as if it were presented as one independent claim. M.P.E.P. § 608.01(n) III, fourth full paragraph. The Office does not make one single mention in its analysis of Elahi, Wright, Thanavala, and Setterstrom as applied to claims 30-62 of the requirement of a basic additive as disclosed in instant claim 1 and therefore imported into claim 30 and all other dependent claims. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims

30-62 are not prima facie obvious in light of the teachings of Elahi, Wright, Thanavala, and Setterstrom, as the Office has not shown that the cited references teach each and every element and limitation of claims 30-62, and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

It is believed that there is no fee or no additional fee associated with the filing and consideration of this document; however, should the Commissioner decide that any fee or fee deficiency is due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any and all fees incurred as a result of entering or considering this document to deposit account number 03-0172.

Respectfully submitted,

Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP

Date: July 27, 2009

By: /milan jovanovic/
Milan Jovanovic
Reg. No. 60,798
(614) 621-7768
(614) 621-0010 (fax)
mjovanovic@calfee.com